A new look at spontaneous symmetry breaking

Alexander Kartavtsev*
Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Föhringer Ring 6, 80805 München, Germany

In this letter we argue that the mechanism of spontaneous symmetry breaking leads to the emergence of a hidden sector and thus may provide a dark matter candidate without the need to introduce additional fields. The same effect can also be interpreted as the emergence of an additional generation and may explain the origin of flavor. To illustrate these ideas we study a real scalar field with double-well potential on a $1+1$ dimensional lattice.

PACS numbers: 11.10.-z
Keywords: spontaneous symmetry breaking, double well, hidden sector, dark matter, origin of flavor

arXiv:1404.5626v1 [hep-ph] 22 Apr 2014

The mechanism of spontaneous symmetry breaking is an important ingredient of modern quantum field theory [1–4]. A textbook example of spontaneous symmetry breaking is a real scalar field with double-well potential,

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\varphi\,\partial^\mu\varphi - \lambda(\varphi^2 - v^2)^2\,. \tag{1}$$

The canonical argument goes as following. The potential has two degenerate minima at $\varphi = \pm v$. Due to infinite space volume transitions between the two minima are forbidden and it is sufficient to consider only one of them, e.g. $\varphi = v$. Introducing $\chi \equiv \varphi - v$ one can then rewrite the Lagrangian in the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\chi\,\partial^\mu\chi - \frac{m^2}{2}\chi^2 - 4\lambda v\chi^3 - \lambda\chi^4\,, \tag{2}$$

where $m^2 = 8\lambda v^2$. The field χ can be quantized in the vicinity of $\chi = 0$. An important implicit assumption here is that the wave-functional $\Psi[\chi(x)]$ is localized in one of the wells and is zero in the other. This assumption is justified by the aforementioned infinite volume suppression of the tunnelling amplitude.

The infinite volume suppression is absent for a $0+1$ dimensional analogue of (1),

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\dot\varphi\dot\varphi - \lambda(\varphi^2 - v^2)^2\,, \tag{3}$$

i.e. in quantum mechanics. A sketch of v-dependence of its first few energy levels is presented in Fig. 1. Evidently, an adiabatic change of v does not change the total number of levels. The low-lying levels, i.e. those with energies smaller than the barrier height, group into pairs with approximately equal energies. The higher levels remain almost unaffected by the change of v. This well-known result is also illustrated by Fig. 2 where we present a sketch of the wave functions of the first few levels. An additional, also well-known, piece of information that we can extract from it is that wave functions of the low-lying states differ from zero in both wells but their pairs can be combined into states that are localized in the left or right well respectively,

$$|\Phi_{L/R,N}\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[\,|\Phi_{2N}\rangle \pm |\Phi_{2N+1}\rangle\right]\,, \tag{4}$$

where $|\Phi_n\rangle$ are eigenvectors of the Hamiltonian. Let us now assume that the potential barrier is high and the initial state is a superposition of a few states lying well bellow the barrier,

$$|\Psi(0)\rangle = \sum_n c_n|\Phi_n\rangle\,, \tag{5}$$

where where $c_n \neq 0$ only for small n. Introducing $c_{L,N} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{2N} + c_{2N+1})$ and $c_{R,N} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{2N} - c_{2N+1})$ we can rewrite (5) in the form

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi(0)\rangle &= \sum_N \left[\,c_{L,N}|\Phi_{L,N}\rangle + c_{R,N}|\Phi_{R,N}\rangle\right] \\ &\equiv |\Psi_L(0)\rangle + |\Psi_R(0)\rangle\,.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

That is, the initial wave function is a linear superposition of two wave functions localized in the left and right well respectively. For $t \neq 0$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_N e^{-i\epsilon_N t} &\\ \times \left(\cos\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\delta_N t\right)\left[\,c_{L,N}|\Phi_{L,N}\rangle + c_{R,N}|\Phi_{R,N}\rangle\right]\right.&\\ \left. + i\sin\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\delta_N t\right)\left[\,c_{R,N}|\Phi_{L,N}\rangle + c_{L,N}|\Phi_{R,N}\rangle\right]\right)\,,&\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\epsilon_N \equiv \frac{1}{2}(E_{2N} + E_{2N+1})$ and $\delta_N \equiv E_{2N+1} - E_{2N}$. For negligibly small δ_N it simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi(t)\rangle &\approx \sum_N e^{-i\epsilon_N t}\left[\,c_{L,N}|\Phi_{L,N}\rangle + c_{R,N}|\Phi_{R,N}\rangle\right] \\ &\equiv |\Psi_L(t)\rangle + |\Psi_R(t)\rangle\,.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

In other words, even for finite t the wave function remains a superposition of two wave functions localized in the left and right well. Importantly, these are decoupled dynamically, which is a direct consequence of the smallness of the tunnelling amplitude between the two wells. Let us stress that whether one of them, e.g. $|\Psi_L(t)\rangle$, is zero or not is a matter of the initial conditions and has nothing to do with the tunnelling probability.

Let us now consider a $1+1$ dimensional analogue of (1) on a lattice of a finite size. The conventional picture of spontaneous symmetry breaking is believed to be correct



FIG. 1: Sketch of v-dependence of the first few energy levels in $0+1$ dimensions. The dashed line gives height of the potential barrier separating the two wells for a given value of v.



FIG. 2: Sketch of the wave functions of the first few levels in $0+1$ dimensions. The potential is indicated by the dashed line.

also on a lattice, provided that the latter is sufficiently large. The Lagrangian takes the from [5]

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{K} \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\dot{\varphi}_\alpha\right)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\nabla\varphi_\alpha\right)^2 - \lambda\left(\varphi_\alpha^2 - v^2\right)^2 \right], \quad (9)$$

where $\nabla\varphi_\alpha = [\varphi_\alpha - \varphi_{\alpha-1}]/\Delta l$, Δl is the distance between the sites and K is the lattice size. We now deal with a system of K coupled oscillators. Let us choose $q_\alpha = \varphi_\alpha$ as the canonical coordinates. The corresponding canonical momenta are $\pi_\alpha = \Delta l\, \dot{\varphi}_\alpha$ and the Hamiltonian takes the form

$$H = \Delta l \sum_{\alpha=1}^{K} \left[\frac{1}{2}\frac{\pi_\alpha^2}{\Delta l^2} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\nabla\varphi_\alpha\right)^2 + \lambda\left(\varphi_\alpha^2 - v^2\right)^2 \right]. \quad (10)$$

In the coordinate representation $\pi_\alpha = -i\partial/\partial\varphi_\alpha$. The spectrum and eigenvectors of (10) can be computed numerically. Here we use a rather simple-minded approach and diagonalize the Hamiltonian matrix with the potential term and the $\varphi_\alpha\varphi_{\alpha-1}$ part of the spatial derivative term treated as a perturbation. The matrix size grows as N^K, where N is the number of levels of the 'unperturbed' Hamiltonian taken into account. Because of the rapidly increasing computational complexity we limit our analysis to rather small lattice sizes and choose $N = 32, 11, 7$ for $K = 2, 3, 4$ respectively. To make sure that the numerics can be trusted we have used the same method to compute spectrum and eigenvectors of a free real scalar field and compared the numerical results with the exact analytical ones [5]. As an additional cross check we use normalization condition for the spectral function, $G_\rho(t_\alpha, x_\alpha; t_\beta, x_\beta) \equiv i\langle 0|[\varphi_\alpha(t_\alpha), \varphi_\beta(t_\beta)]|0\rangle$. Its derivative with respect to t_α is just an expectation value of the canonical commutation relation and therefore $\Delta l \cdot \partial_{t_\alpha} G_\rho(t_\alpha, x_\alpha; t_\beta, x_\beta)|_{t_\beta = t_\alpha} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$. Using the Källen-Lehman representation we can rewrite it as a normalization condition,

$$\Delta l \sum_n |\langle 0|\varphi_\alpha|\Phi_n\rangle|^2 (E_n - E_0) = 1\,, \quad (11)$$

where α is arbitrary. The arbitrariness of α reflects translational invariance of the system.

In $1+1$ dimensions φ and v are dimensionless, whereas λ has the dimension of mass squared. For the numerics we choose $\Delta l = 1 \cdot \mu^{-1}$ and $\lambda = 1 \cdot \mu^2$, where μ is a mass parameter. A sketch of the wave functionals of the ground and first excited states for $K = 2$ and $v = 1.5$ is presented in Fig. 3. Just like in $0+1$ dimensions we observe that wave functionals of the low-lying states differ from zero in both wells, but their pairs can be combined into states localized in the left or right well respectively. As expected [6], the energy splittings between the low-lying pairs rapidly decrease with increasing lattice size. Eqs. (4) – (8) then directly apply to the $1+1$ dimensional case and we conclude that the left and right well components of the wave functional are decoupled, i.e. that dynamics of $|\Psi_R\rangle$ is not affected by $|\Psi_L\rangle$ and vice versa. Again, the question if one of them is zero or not is a matter of the initial conditions and has nothing to do with the smallness of the tunnelling amplitude.

Importantly, for sizeable v and λ (we will clarify what this means bellow) the shapes of $|\Phi_{L,N}\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{R,N}\rangle$ coincide (up to perturbative corrections) with shapes of the wave functionals of a free field with mass $m^2 = 8\lambda v^2$ [5]. Wave functionals of the free field (and in particular those corresponding to one-particle states) can be classified according to their spatial momentum. Therefore, for each value of the spatial momentum we now have two distinct



FIG. 3: Sketch of wave functionals (color-coded 2-d projection of the 3-d plots) of the ground (top-left), first excited (top-right), sixth excited (bottom-left) and seventh excited (bottom-right) states for $K = 2$ and $v = 1.5$.



FIG. 4: Sketch of v-dependence of the first few energy levels for $K = 2$. The dashed line gives height of the potential barrier *defined* here as value of the potential (including the spatial derivative) for a configuration $\varphi_\alpha = 0$ at a *single* site x_α and $\varphi_\beta = v$ (or $\varphi_\beta = -v$) for *all* $x_\beta \neq x_\alpha$.

(low-lying) excitations, even though the Lagrangian (1) contains only one fundamental field.

This observation allows for an interesting interpretation. Imagine an observer made of the right well excitations. This observer would perceive the left well excitations as hidden sector particles that interact gravitationally but are invisible otherwise. In other words, the left well excitations would play the role of *dark matter* for the right well observer. Whether both wells are filled or not depends on the history of the Universe's expansion.

Another interesting interpretation is possible if φ couples to some other field (let's call it ξ). Imagine that ξ can decay into the left and right well excitations. From the 'viewpoint' of ξ these are decays into particles with the same quantum numbers (and, admittedly, same masses in the case under consideration) which are nevertheless distinct. This strongly resembles decays of the W and Z bosons into fermions of the three generations which have different masses but the same quantum numbers. In other words, the same effect may be interpreted as the emergence of an additional generation and thus may explain the *origin of flavor*.

Both interpretations immediately pose the question where the additional degrees of freedom come from. The answer can be read off Fig. 4 where we present a sketch of v-dependence of the first few energy levels for $K = 2$. Qualitatively it is very similar to Fig. 1. As we adiabatically increase v the total number of levels (which is infinite anyway) remains unchanged. However, the changing shape of the potential 'drags' some of the energy levels down, increases the density of the low-lying states and doubles the number of states with almost equal energy. Their orthogonal combinations can be interpreted as the left and right well excitations.

It is important to keep in mind that the above conclusions are valid only for the low-lying states. The higher states are not very sensitive (at least on a lattice) to the value of v and are not subject to the 'doubling' of the levels. Wave functionals of these states substantially differ from zero also outside of the $\varphi_\alpha < 0$ and $\varphi_\alpha > 0$ (for all α) regions, see Fig. 3. In other words they are not localized in the two wells like the low-lying ones.

This observation raises the question if the ground state is localized in the two wells for arbitrarily small v. After all, we definitely do not expect any localization for $v = 0$ as there are no wells. It is conceivable that the degree of localization, which we define as contribution of the two wells to the normalization of the wave functional,

$$\mathcal{N}_{L+R} \equiv 2 \int_0^\infty d\varphi_1 \ldots \int_0^\infty d\varphi_K \, |\Phi_0(\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_K)|^2 \,, \quad (12)$$

gradually raises with increasing v. Numerical results, see Fig. 5, support this hypothesis. The fraction of the total field-space volume in the two wells rapidly decreases with the lattice size as 2^{1-K}. Thus, if for a given v the ground state is not localized in the two wells then $\mathcal{N}_{L+R}$ should decrease with increasing lattice size. This is precisely what we observe for small v. For large v the ground state is completely localized for any lattice size.

The fact that for small v the field is not localized in one or both wells means that there fluctuations that semi-locally, i.e. at only a few sites, take the field from one



FIG. 5: Localization of the ground state, $\mathcal{N}_{L+R}$, as a function of the lattice size, K, for (from bottom to top) $v = 0$, $v = 0.9$, $v = 1$, $v = 1.1$, $v = 1.2$ and $v = 1.5$.



FIG. 6: Square root of mean square deviation, $\langle 0|\varphi_\alpha^2|0\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$, as a function of v for lattice sizes $K = 2, 3, 4$.

well to the other. Physically, one expects that the leading contribution is due to fluctuations at a single site. The amplitude of such *local* fluctuations should not strongly depend on the lattice size. Numerical results confirm that this is indeed the case, see Fig. 6 where we plot $\langle 0|\varphi_\alpha^2|0\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ as a function of v. The curves computed for the three values of the lattice size practically overlap. Fig. 6 implies that there are two distinct regimes. The first regime is characterised by an almost constant $\langle 0|\varphi_\alpha^2|0\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and is realised for small v. Comparing Fig. 6 with Fig. 4 we see that in the corresponding range of v energy of the ground state is higher than the potential barrier and there is no strict separation for any lattice size. This is consistent with the observation that infinite volume alone is insufficient to suppress local quantum fluctuations [5]. The second regime is characterised by an almost linear dependence of $\langle 0|\varphi_\alpha^2|0\rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}$ on v and is realised for large v. In the corresponding range of v energy of the ground state is smaller than the potential barrier and the ground state is completely localized in the two wells.

To summarize, we have studied a real scalar field with double well potential on a $1+1$ dimensional lattice. For a high potential barrier the low-lying states group into pairs with almost equal energy and can be combined into states localized in the left and right well respectively. Due to vanishingly small tunnelling amplitude the left and right well excitations are dynamically decoupled. Therefore an observer made e.g. of the right well excitations would perceive the left well excitations as hidden sector particles. In other words, this mechanism may provide a *dark matter* candidate without the need to introduce any additional fields. Alternatively, if the scalar field couples to some other field, the left and right well excitations can be interpreted as two generations, i.e. particles that have the same quantum numbers but are nevertheless distinct. In other words, the same mechanism may also explain the *origin of flavor*. For a low potential barrier even the ground state is not localized and the field semi-locally fluctuates between the two wells.

It is very tempting to think that a similar effect related to the Brout-Englert-Higgs mechanism in the Standard Model may explain the existence of the three fermionic generations and solve the mystery of neutrino masses. In particular, it is intriguing that the number of angular degrees of freedom of the Higgs field coincides with the number of generations. And even though the existence of three generations of *right-handed* leptons poses an obvious obstacle to such an explanation, this possibility definitely deserves further investigation.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank P. Weisz for providing references to literature on lattice field theory.

* alexander.kartavtsev@mpp.mpg.de

[1] P. W. Higgs, Phys.Lett. **12**, 132 (1964).
[2] P. W. Higgs, Phys.Rev.Lett. **13**, 508 (1964).
[3] F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys.Rev.Lett. **13**, 321 (1964).
[4] G. Guralnik, C. Hagen, and T. Kibble, Phys.Rev.Lett. **13**, 585 (1964).
[5] A. Kartavtsev (2014), "Infinite volume suppression versus quantum fluctuations".
[6] G. Munster, Nucl.Phys. **B324**, 630 (1989).